

03/29/2004 18:27

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 31 2004

=== COVER PAGE ===

Unofficial

TO: _____

FROM: RABIN AND BERDO PC

FAX: 2024080924

TEL: 2024080924

COMMENT:

PAGE 1/3 * RCVD AT 3/29/2004 6:29:56 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFAX-1/1 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:2024080924 * DURATION (mm-ss):01-00

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Rabin & Berdo, P.C.

Suite 500
1101 14 Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202)371-8978
Telefax: (202)408-0924
E-MAIL: firm@rabinchamp.com

Fax **REMINDER** **URGENT**
3-29-04

To:	Examiner Steven A. Bratlie	From:	Qixia Zhang for Robert H. Berdo, Jr.
Firm:	Group Art Unit: 3652; U.S. Patent and Trademark Office		
Fax:	703-872-9306	Pages:	2 (including cover sheet)
Phone:	703-308-2669	Date:	March 23, 2004
Serial No.:	09/705,733	Our Ref.:	WOO 108
Inventor:	Kuan-Chou CHEN et al.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urgent - <input type="checkbox"/> For Review - <input type="checkbox"/> Please Comment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please Reply - <input type="checkbox"/> Please Recycle			

• **Comments:** **PLEASE DELIVER TO EXAMINER**
IMMEDIATELY. - thank you

Dear Examiner Steven A. Bratlie:

We acknowledge, with thanks, receipt of the Office Action dated May 14, 2003. Upon review, it has been determined that Form PTO-892 (Notice of References Cited) and all of the references are missing. It is respectfully requested that the said documents be sent to us at your earliest convenience. Otherwise, we don't know patent numbers cited by examiner on page 2, paragraph 4 (see Appendix A).

If you have any question, please do not hesitate to call me. My direct telephone No. is (202)326-0214. Our fax No. is (202)408-0924

Best regards,

Qixia Zhang

Application/Control Number: 09/705,733
Art Unit: 3653

Page 2

Appendix A

1. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Examples of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification are:

page 8 Lines 14-17 inaccurate

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 31 2004

Unofficial

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Williams, et al in view of Gordon, et al and Nering, et al.

Williams et al disclose a substantially similar FOUP unloader in Fig. 8. Note *We do not know the patent Number because we did not receive Form PTO-892*
clamp #124 and door remover #126. Williams et al lack screw actuation. Screw
actuation is disclosed by element #72 of Gordon et al and by Nering et al. It would have